

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 12 and 13 are now in the case. Claim 12 has been amended to recite that the particulate cellulosic material is a dry-added component of the detergent composition. Basis is at Claim 18, now canceled as redundant. Claim 12 has been further amended to recite that the cellulosic material comprises a polyacrylate and or maleic/acrylic acid polymer binder. Basis is in the specification at page 33, Preformed Particles G and H (the AA or MA/AA abbreviations are defined at page 31, l. 1-5). It is submitted that the amendment adds no new matter, and entry is requested.

Formal Matters

For the record, there are no objections or rejections under 35 USC 112 outstanding.

Rejection Under 35 USC 102

All claims stand rejected over U.S. 6,384,011 and , separately, over WO 99/14295, for reasons of record at pages 2-3 of the Office Action.

Applicants respectfully traverse all rejections, to the extent they may apply to amended Claim 12 and dependent Claim 13, now in the case.

At the outset, all arguments previously presented in support of patentability continue to apply to Claim 12 (amended) and claim 13, but will not be exhaustively repeated here, for the sake of brevity.

As indicated on its face, U.S. 6,384,011 B1 relates to PCT Pub. No. WO 99/14295, PCT Pub. Date March 25, 1999, having the same inventors and the same assignee. Since the two cited documents are directly related, it seems appropriate to discuss them together. (In addition, U.S. 6,630,436 has been noted only to show particle sizes of detergents.)

The cited documents relate to detergent compositions comprising cellulosic polymeric or oligomeric ingredients which impart fabric appearance and integrity benefits.

As previously discussed, nothing in the cited documents relates to the problem/solution aspect of the present invention. Also as previously discussed, the problem/solution aspect of the present invention must be considered under §103.


But the differences between the present invention and the cited documents go beyond a problem/solution analysis. As now amended, the claims herein not only require the particles comprising the cellulosic material to be of a certain size, they must also comprise the claimed binder(s) and must be present in the detergent compositions as a dry-added particulate.

In this regard, it is submitted that the '436 disclosures of detergent particle sizes teaches nothing with respect to the particle size of the present cellulose. Again, the problem/solution aspect of the present invention is not obvious from the detergent particle size disclosed therein.

To summarize: It is submitted that the cited documents do not recognize the problem addressed herein. It is further submitted that the cited documents do not suggest the solution (particle size) disclosed herein. Importantly, the documents do not suggest solving the problem by means of dry-added cellulosic particles comprising the binder(s) of the amended claims. Absent some teaching or suggestion of the foregoing elements, it is submitted that the rejections under §103 should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, early and favorable action in the case is requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Pettifer et al.

By 
Jerry J. Yeffler
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 26,598
(513) 627-1907

January 29, 2004
Customer No. 27752
(CM2173 RCE Amendment-Response to Office Action.doc)
Revised 10/14/2003